



**MINUTES
OF THE
CONSERVATION ACQUISITION BOARD (CAB)
OF
ARIZONA STATE PARKS
Meeting of October 11, 2011
Arizona State Parks
1300 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona**

A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair McNichol called the meeting to order at 11:05 a.m.

CAB Members Present:

Christopher McNichol, Chair
John Graham
Taber Anderson
Jeff Swango
Melinda Gulick

CAB Members Absent:

Stephen Brophy

Arizona State Parks Staff Present:

Jay Ziemann, Assistant Director,
Arizona State Parks (ASP)
Doris Pulsifer, Resources &
Public Programs, ASP

B. ACTION ITEMS

1. The CAB will discuss and analyze a Matrix of Advisory Committees' Roles and Responsibilities along with a Decision Flowchart model for Evaluating Agencies, Boards, Commissions, which has been adopted by the Governor's Commission of Privatization and Efficiency (COPE), in order to self-apply the COPE adopted criteria/flowchart to the CAB and forward their analysis to the Arizona State Parks Board.

Jay Ziemann began the meeting by providing background as to the purpose of the meeting and why CAB is discussing this particular topic and schematic.

Mr. Ziemann explained that in January 2010 Governor Brewer by Executive Order created the Arizona Commission of Privatization and Efficiency (COPE). They released some initial recommendations in September 2010. The State Parks Board was featured very prominently in those recommendations. COPE in their preliminary report recommended essentially that State Parks be privatized. The final report of COPE was due by the end of December 2010. When the initial report came out, State Parks was finally able to voice their concerns and the problems with COPE's suggestions to the Governor's office. The final report did not come out until July 2011. Remarkably, any specific mention of Arizona State Parks was totally dropped from their final recommendation. So, the recommendation, which dealt with privatizing State Parks, disappeared. The only place on the final report where Parks was at least peripherally affected was Recommendation #4 – Elimination, Merger, Efficiency Review or Privatization of Agencies, Boards or Commissions.

COPE adopted a schematic that was originally authored in the State of Virginia, (a copy of which was provided to CAB members). COPE preliminarily reviewed 75 state agencies and ran them through this process. They then came up with recommendations and put them into a "Table 5". However, Table 5 was never released, so nobody knows what Table 5 is. In July 2011, the Parks Board in recognition of the elimination of the Heritage Fund and a significant reduction in staff resources due to budget cuts, asked staff to review each of the ten advisory groups that work with the Parks Board. They also asked that staff meet with each of the advisory committees and run them through the Virginia schematic that was adopted by COPE and report back to the State Parks Board in November. The Board at that time will make some recommendations. Although, because CAB is established in statute, there is very little that the Board can do regarding CAB.

Chair McNichol asked if there had been any preliminary assessments made of CAB, or anything that the CAB needs to springboard off of in terms of making some kind of initial assessment. Mr. Ziemann responded that there had been no preliminary assessments. He added that staff would not be taking a position; they will only be recording and passing on to the Board each committee's input.

Chair McNichol asked if any of this was relevant to CAB since the committee is statutorily created. Mr. Ziemann responded that the Board could recommend that the statute be changed, but the Board cannot do anything unilaterally.

The CAB members then proceeded to answer the questions in the schematic, starting with question 1 a.

Chair McNichol asked the CAB question 1a. Does the “Purpose” still exist?

It was the general consensus of the CAB that the purpose of CAB still exists because there is still money (approximately \$40 million) left for distribution, and there are still lands that are designated as suitable for conservation purposes that remain available for acquisition purposes.

Chair McNichol read question #2 – “Can the CAB demonstrate effectiveness”? Chair McNichol responded “yes”, the CAB is effective once a year (when it meets to recommend Growing Smarter State Trust Land Grants).

Chair McNichol read question #3 – “Is the State’s involvement critical”? Chair McNichol responded, “yes”, because it is mandated since this is a statutory function and nobody else but the state can do it.

Chair McNichol read question #3a – “Is the role of the CAB duplicative”? Chair McNichol responded “no”, because the CAB has been reposed with the responsibility of reviewing and recommending to the Board appropriate grants from the Land Conservation Fund. He added that obviously if someone was to take a credibly global view of this, what CAB does could probably be rolled into another group. However, that would require another statutory change.

Chair McNichol read question #3b – “Does the CAB meet regularly”? Chair McNichol responded “yes”.

Chair McNichol read question #4 – “Does the CAB reflect the priorities of the Board”? Chair McNichol responded “yes”.
The members of HPAC concurred that the answer to question #4 is “yes”.

Chair McNichol read question #5 – “Can the CAB be efficiently and effectively filled”? Chair McNichol responded “yes”.



Chair McNichol read question #6 – “Does the CAB reflect or mirror the Board”? Chair McNichol responded “yes”, the Board each year has approved all of the recommendations made by CAB.

Chair McNichol read the last question #7 – “Does the CAB provide effective advice to the Board”? Chair McNichol responded “yes”.

Chair McNichol asked the CAB members if they had comments, or anything they differed with, or critic.

The members of CAB all concurred with all of the responses to the questions in the schematic.

Mr. Ziemann stated that staff would summarize the responses and pass them along to the Parks Board.

Mr. Ziemann stated that agenda and information regarding the November Parks Board meeting will be sent to each of the CAB members and invited them to send someone from the group to represent CAB in front of the Board on November 30th at the City Council Chambers of Apache Junction.

Chair McNichol stated that he might be available to attend. Ms. Gulick also stated that she could be available if needed.

C. CALL TO THE PUBLIC: There were no responses to the call to the public.

**D. SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS, MATTERS OF HPAC
PROCEDURE REQUESTS AND ITEMS FOR FUTURE EVENTS:** None

E. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was declared adjourned by Chair McNichol at 11:30 am.

Respectfully submitted by:

Doris Pulsifer, Chief of Resources & Public Programs



Minutes of CAB
October 11, 2011